

years go by, until polygamy becomes a thing of the past. Any attempt to reopen the question by giving direct or indirect sanction to the practice would bring on a political controversy which could result only in one way, namely, in the continuance of present laws, and then to the enforcement of the law would be added the bitterness and prejudice which such a contest would be sure to arouse.

++

The trusts generally issue two kinds of stock—preferred and common. The preferred stock is intended for the preferred people and the common stock for the common people. The preferred stock has a fixed dividend, which must be paid before any dividend can be declared on the common stock; the common stock, therefore, is subject to the greater fluctuation. It might with propriety be called lamb's food, because it is most popular with young sheep before they have experienced the first shearing.

++

Grates Harshly "Down with the Americans" is the popular cry among the people of the Philippines. "Down with the Americans" is the cry that resounded throughout Porto Rico last week. Even in Cuba they are beginning to whisper, "Down with the Americans. When the Spaniards called us 'Yankee pigs' we were not in the least disturbed; on the contrary, we rather enjoyed it. Our conscience was clear. It was natural for a people engaged in upholding a despotism to show their hatred for a people devoted to liberty and a republican form of government. But this cry, 'Down with the Americans,' has become altogether too popular among people who have shown their devotion to liberty as thoroughly as we ever displayed our love for liberty.

Is it not about time for thoughtful Americans to ask what we have done to provoke this popular cry? Why have we done it, and why do we persist in it to the detriment of our material interests, the disturbance of our conscience and the destruction of our reputation as the foremost champions of liberty?

++

Without a Country. In the case of the Porto Ricans Congress formally declared them to be—not citizens of the United States—but "citizens of Porto Rico."

It is interesting also to note that in all former annexations by treaty, provision has been made for the "naturalization by election" of subjects of the sovereign from whom we acquired the territory.

In the Paris treaty, it will be observed, a slight effort was made to conform to this rule.

It will be noted that article 9 of that treaty provides that Spanish subjects living in the Philippines, but not born there, may preserve their allegiance to the crown of Spain by complying with certain conditions, in default of which they "shall be held to have renounced it and to have adopted the nationality of the territory in which they may reside."

This provision under present conditions provides food for interesting thought.

The people of the Philippines who are subject to our authority have no nationality. They are not allowed to become citizens of the United

States, nor are they allowed to build up a nationality for themselves.

If the Spanish-born resident of the Philippines concluded to avail himself of the privileges of Article 9 of the Paris treaty, renounced his allegiance to the crown of Spain, and proclaimed his allegiance to the nationality of the territory in which he resided (the Philippine Islands) what would be the status of that person? He would owe allegiance to the United States of America, but would he be a citizen or a subject of this government?

Perhaps he would be a "citizen of the Philippine Islands" like the "citizen of Porto Rico"—a man living under a government in which he has no voice, owing allegiance to a government in which he has no share and expected to pay homage to a government by which he is guaranteed no rights, privileges or immunities—not even those which are guaranteed to the subjects of a monarch.

++

The Cost of a Congressman Livingston, the democratic member of the House Committee on Appropriations, has issued a statement comparing the appropriations of the recent Congress with that of the Congress that died March 4, 1897. The Fifty-sixth Congress appropriated \$1,440,062,545.95. Congressman Cannon for the republicans points out that this is a decrease of \$128,000,000 from the appropriations made by the Fifty-fifth Congress, which was the immediate predecessor of the recent one.

But Congressman Livingston maintains that it is better to make the comparison with the Fifty-fourth Congress, that being the last to make appropriations for the support of the government prior to the war with Spain.

Mr. Livingston shows that the appropriations made by the Fifty-sixth Congress exceed those made by the Fifty-fourth Congress in the sum of \$395,482,272.08. He calls attention to the fact that nearly all this increase was due to appropriations for the support of the military establishments. For each of the two years prior to the Spanish-American war, the regular army cost \$23,000,000. Since then, however, it has increased to \$115,000,000 per year. The Fifty-fourth Congress appropriated \$30,000,000 for the navy, while the Fifty-sixth Congress appropriated for the navy \$143,793,000. During the last two years the pension appropriations have increased \$8,000,000.

++

Is This "Sound Money?" The Chicago Tribune expresses marked gratification because of the "gradual retirement of the treasury notes." It rejoices to say that these notes issued under the Sherman law of 1890 to the extent of \$158,451,488, have been redeemed so rapidly that only \$55,256,000 of these notes remain outstanding.

The Tribune is pleased because these treasury notes were payable in either gold or silver, and for them silver certificates payable in silver dollars have been substituted.

It points with pride to the fact that "under the new financial law passed a year ago, this process of changing treasury notes into silver certificates was expedited," and adds: "Thus it will be seen that two-thirds of this dangerous class of paper money has finally been wiped out."

The Tribune places itself in a peculiar position. Republican organs have contended that gold is the only sound money, and here we find a radical republican organ boasting that the administration has succeeded in substituting \$100,000,000 of money that may be redeemed only in the hated "50 cent silver dollar" for the same amount of money that would have been redeemed in the so called "honest money of the land."

Now, as a matter of fact, the financial law passed a year ago is so framed that it may be interpreted by the secretary of the treasury to give authority for the redemption in gold of even the silver certificate, which on its face provides for redemption in silver. This being so, what advantage has been gained by the substitution of the silver certificate for the treasury note?

Is it because under the new law the secretary would have the option of redeeming the silver certificate in gold, and that that option would not rest with the holder of the silver certificate? If this is wise, if this is honest, what becomes of the claim so often made by republican orators and organs, that the option must rest always with the holder of the obligation, because an "honest government" must always be willing to pay its obligation in "sound money"—otherwise known as gold?

If the republican contention on the financial question is correct, then one of two propositions is true: either nothing has been gained by the substitution of silver certificates for treasury notes, or else the administration has perpetrated a fraud upon the holders of the treasury notes by persuading them to surrender money that always calls for gold, and accept in its place money that calls for a "dishonest dollar."

++

An Insult to Democrats. It is unfortunate from a party standpoint that Mr. Wells was nominated for mayor by the democrats of St. Louis. It would be a reflection on the democrats of that city to assume that none of them possessed the necessary qualifications for mayor. It would be an insult to the honest, intelligent and faithful democrats of St. Louis to say that none of them could be trusted to give the city a good administration. The main argument, if not the only one, made in favor of Mr. Wells' nomination was that he was a man who could "win." It seems, then, that he was nominated because he was thought available. Why available?

The Republic says that "Jefferson Club leaders nearly all opposed the nomination of Wells," and adds that he was nominated by "business men." Are these the same business men who have been giving support to the republican national administration? According to the Republic's logic the democratic party must go to the "business men" whenever they refuse to come to the party. If so, the situation becomes clearer. When they refuse to vote for a democrat the remedy seems to be to nominate a republican. If this is good local politics, it may be applied on a larger scale. In other words, party principles are to be ignored and party success is to be the only thing considered.

THE COMMONER insists upon its original proposition. If the situation in St. Louis is such that democrats are justified in supporting a republican, the candidate ought not to be called a democrat or placed in a position where he can make the party responsible for the enforcement of republican ideas.